

of cottonseed meal and cottonseed hulls, and was offered for sale and sold under the distinctive name of another article, to wit, cottonseed meal.

On May 25, 1920, a plea of guilty to the information was entered on the behalf of the defendant corporation, and the court imposed a fine of \$25 and costs.

E. D. BALL, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

**S229. Misbranding of Santaletas. U. S. \* \* \* v. 6 Dozen Bottles of Santaletas. Default decree of condemnation, forfeiture, and destruction. (F. & D. No. 11373. I. S. No. 17023-r. S. No. E-1774.)**

On October 14, 1919, the United States attorney for the District of Porto Rico, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district a libel for the seizure and condemnation of 6 dozen bottles of Santaletas, remaining in the original unbroken packages at San Juan, P. R., alleging that the article had been shipped by G. J. Fajardo, New York, N. Y., on or about March 31, 1917, and transported from the State of New York to the Island of Porto Rico, and charging misbranding in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, as amended. The article was labeled in part on the wrapper, "Santaletas Sharp & Dohme, Baltimore, E. U. de A."

Analysis of a sample of the article by the Bureau of Chemistry of this department showed that it consisted of capsules containing oil of sandal wood.

It was alleged in substance in the libel that the article was misbranded so as to mislead and deceive the purchaser or purchasers thereof for the reason that certain statements regarding the curative and therapeutic effects of the said article, appearing in the circular accompanying it, falsely and fraudulently represented it as effective in catarrhal affections of the genito-urinary apparatus, as a cure for chronic gonorrhea, blennorrhea, and other troubles of the urinary canal, and as a treatment for catarrh of the bladder, acute or chronic, due to gonorrheal affections or to other causes, whereas, in truth and in fact, it was not.

On November 28, 1919, no claimant having appeared for the product, judgment of condemnation and forfeiture was entered, and it was ordered by the court that the product be destroyed by the United States marshal.

E. D. BALL, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

**S230. Misbranding of Pinkolo ointment. U. S. \* \* \* v. 1 Dozen Large-Size Tubes and 1 Dozen Small-Size Tubes of Pinkolo Ointment. Default decree of condemnation, forfeiture, and destruction. (F. & D. No. 11407. I. S. No. 17043-r. S. No. E-1685.)**

On October 4, 1919, the United States attorney for the District of Porto Rico, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district a libel for the seizure and condemnation of 1 dozen large-size and 1 dozen small-size tubes of Pinkolo ointment, remaining in the original unbroken packages at Ponce, P. R., alleging that the article had been sold and offered for sale in Ponce, P. R., on July 23, 1919, and charging misbranding in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, as amended. The article was labeled in part, "Oleum Rubrum Pinkolo Guaranteed by Custer Chemical Co. New York, U. S. A. under the Food and Drugs Act, June 30, 1906."

Analysis of a sample of the article by the Bureau of Chemistry of this department showed that the active ingredients of the ointment were camphor, red mercuric oxid, and zinc oxid.

It was alleged in the libel that the article was misbranded so as to deceive and mislead the purchaser or purchasers thereof, in that the following state-